

had now is 27. It is down to 18. This is hard work. It is tons of work. My wife Julie and her family also raised sled dogs. It is really hard work, particularly in the cold, interior Alaska winters. And it is also dangerous, as Rod can attest.

In 2000, when competing for the first time in the 200-mile Tustumena 200 Sled Dog Race on the Kenai Peninsula, he took a wrong turn. It was snowing hard. It was difficult to see. The trail got obliterated. And he couldn't figure out how to get back on the trail. So he staked his dogs and hunkered down on a ridge to build camp. He had some candy, Reese's Pieces, dried lamb for the dogs. He had a cooker, thermos, some fuel, some twigs. He had bunny boots, fortunately, but not a parka.

He spent his days exploring, going as far as he dared to try to find the trail at night. At night, he could hear the helicopters above, looking for Rod, but they couldn't see him through the cloud cover.

What was going on turned out to be one of the largest land search and rescue missions in Alaska history, trying to find Rod Boyce, the intrepid editor of the *News-Miner*. But he didn't know that. He just knew that his days were ticking away. Rod's wife Julie was worried sick, of course, but kept it together throughout. On the sixth day—sixth day—almost a week, when the sky cleared, he headed out again and a snow machine came his way. "I think I am the guy you're looking for," he told the driver, Ron Poston. Ron gave him a candy bar and a ride to safety.

That night, he and his wife celebrated with a beer and a cheeseburger. His feet were in bad shape, but otherwise he was unharmed. When he made it back to the newsroom, his fellow reporters put up markers that led from his parking space into the building in case he got lost again. He thought it was pretty funny.

On January 22, Rod Boyce left the *News-Miner* to take a job as a science writer and public information officer at the very cool and esteemed Geophysical Institute at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. He spends his days now writing about Tsunamis and the skies and the heavens. He said:

It is a nerd's dream . . . I had a good 35-year run in newspapers and was very fortunate to experience the things that I did and interact with all sorts of public officials and regular folks on the street. I got to see them at their highs and lows, their tragedies and their happiest moments.

He still has hopes for local news. "A local news outlet can tie a local community together and that is super important. I hope that never changes," said Rod.

Me, too, Rod. Here is to local journalism. Here is to the mighty Fairbanks *News-Miner*, and here is to Rod Boyce. Thank you for being the guy behind the headlines all these many years. Thank you for keeping our communities and interior connected, and congratulations on perhaps one of the

biggest awards you have ever received, our Alaskan of the Week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The majority leader.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 1868

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1868), to prevent across-the-board direct spending cuts, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHUMER. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be read on the next legislative day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

FILIBUSTER

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak at some length, if time will permit me, about the same subject my friend from Washington State so eloquently addressed. My colleagues know that although when I speak, I sometimes get very passionate, I have not very often, in past years, risen to the floor for any extended period of time. I do that today because so much is at stake.

For over 200 years, the Senate has embodied the brilliance of our Founding Fathers in creating an intricate system of checks and balances among the three branches of Government. This system has served two critical purposes, both allowing the Senate to act as an independent, restraining force on the excesses of the executive branch, and protecting minority rights within the Senate itself. The Framers used this dual system of checks and balances to underscore the independent nature of the Senate and its members.

The Framers sought not to ensure simple majority rule, but to allow minority views—whether they are conservative, liberal, or moderate—to have an enduring role in the Senate in order to check the excesses of the majority. This system is now being tested in the extreme.

I believe the proposed course of action we are hearing about these days is one that has the potential to do more damage to this system than anything that has occurred since I have become a Senator.

History will judge us harshly, in my view, if we eliminate over 200 years of precedent and procedure in this body and, I might add, doing it by breaking a second rule of the Senate, and that is changing the rules of the Senate by a mere majority vote.

When examining the Senate's proper role in our system of Government generally and in the process of judicial nominations specifically, we should begin, in my view, but not end with our Founding Fathers. As any grade school student knows, our Government is one that was infused by the Framers with checks and balances.

I should have said at the outset that I owe special thanks—and I will list them—to a group of constitutional scholars and law professors in some of our great universities and law schools for editing this speech for me and for helping me write this speech because I think it may be one of the most important speeches for historical purposes that I will have given in the 32 years since I have been in the Senate.

When examining the Senate's proper role in our system of Government and in the process of judicial nominations, as I said, we have to look at what our Founders thought about when they talked about checks and balances.

The theoretical underpinning of this system can be found in *Federalist 51* where the architect of our Constitution, James Madison, advanced his famous theory that the Constitution set up a system in which "ambition must be made to counteract ambition."

"Ambition must be made to counteract ambition." As Madison notes, this is because "[The] great security against a gradual concentration of the several powers in the same department consists in giving those who administer each department the necessary constitutional means and personal motives to resist encroachments by the other."

Our Founders made the conscious decision to set up a system of government that was different from the English parliamentary system—the system, by the way, with which they were the most familiar. The Founders reacted viscerally to the aggrandizement of power in any one branch or any person, even in a person or body elected by the majority of the citizens of this country.

Under the system the Founders created, they made sure that no longer would any one person or one body be able to run roughshod over everyone else. They wanted to allow the sovereign people—not the sovereign Government, the sovereign people—to pursue a strategy of divide and conquer and, in the process, to protect the few against the excesses of the many which they would witness in the French Revolution.

The independence of the judiciary was vital to the success of that venture. As *Federalist 78* notes:

The complete independence of the courts of justice is peculiarly essential in a limited Constitution.

Our Founders felt strongly that judges should exercise independent judgment and not be beholden to any one person or one body. John Adams, in 1776, stated:

The dignity and stability of government in all its branches, the morals of the people,